

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

<p>Alan L. Burns, # 143218,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>Wanda Hagler Haile; and South Carolina Office of Appellate Defense,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants.</p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p><b>C/A No. 4:07-3736-JFA-TER</b></p> <p><b>Report and Recommendation</b></p>
--	---	---

---

***Background of this Case***

The plaintiff is an inmate at the Evans Correctional Institution of the South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC). The South Carolina Department of Corrections website ([www.doc.sc.gov](http://www.doc.sc.gov)) indicates that the plaintiff is currently incarcerated on a conviction for a lewd act on a child under the age of sixteen. The conviction was entered in the Court of General Sessions for Charleston County in 2003.

The plaintiff has brought suit against his former appellate defender and the South Carolina Office of Appellate Defense for the filing of an *Anders* brief<sup>1</sup> without his consent in his direct appeal in 2003. The plaintiff alleges legal malpractice and constitutional violations. The plaintiff seeks

---

<sup>1</sup>*Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967).

\$75,000 in punitive damages, a court order barring the defendants from filing any pleadings “without first giving notice and obtaining consent” from their clients, court costs, and fees.

### ***Discussion***

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review<sup>2</sup> has been made of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915, 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act. The review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-325 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995)(*en banc*), *cert. denied*, 516 U.S. 1177 (1996); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Boyce v. Alizaduh*, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979)(recognizing the district court’s authority to conduct an initial screening of any *pro se* filing);<sup>3</sup> *Loe v. Armistead*, 582 F.2d 1291 (4th Cir. 1978), *cert. denied*, *Moffitt v. Loe*, 446 U.S. 928 (1980); and *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, *Leeke v. Gordon*, 439 U.S. 970 (1978). The plaintiff is a *pro se* litigant, and thus his pleadings are accorded liberal construction. *See Erickson v. Pardus*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 75 U.S.L.W. 3643, 167 L.Ed.2d 1081, 127 S.Ct. 2197 (2007)(*per curiam*); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9-10 & n. 7 (1980)(*per curiam*); and *Cruz v. Beto*,

---

<sup>2</sup>Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (DSC), the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

<sup>3</sup>*Boyce* has been held by some authorities to have been abrogated in part, on other grounds, by *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989)(insofar as *Neitzke* establishes that a complaint that fails to state a claim, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), does not by definition merit *sua sponte* dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) [formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)], as “frivolous”).

405 U.S. 319 (1972). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint or petition, the plaintiff's or petitioner's allegations are assumed to be true. *Fine v. City of New York*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2nd Cir. 1975). Even under this less stringent standard, the § 1983 complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Department of Social Services*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

The plaintiff's former appellate defender, Wanda Hagler Haile, and the South Carolina Office of Appellate Defense are entitled to summary dismissal because they have not acted under color of state law. In order to state a cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that: (1) the defendant(s) deprived him or her of a federal right, and (2) did so under color of state law. *See Gomez v. Toledo*, 446 U.S. 635, 640 (1980); and *American Mfr. Mut. Ins. Co. v. Sullivan*, 526 U.S. 40, 50-52 (1999).

An attorney, whether retained, court-appointed, or a public defender, does not act under color of state law, which is a jurisdictional prerequisite for any civil action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See Deas v. Potts*, 547 F.2d 800 (4th Cir. 1976) (private attorney); *Hall v. Quillen*, 631 F.2d 1154, 1155-1156 & nn. 2-3 (4th Cir. 1980), *cert. denied*, 454 U.S. 1141 (1982) (court-appointed attorney); and *Polk County v. Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312, 317-324 & nn. 8-16 (1981) (public defender).

The district court in *Hall v. Quillen* had disposed of the case against a physician and a court-appointed attorney on grounds of immunity. In affirming the district court's order, the Court of Appeals, however, indicated that lower courts should first determine whether state action occurred:

But immunity as a defense only becomes a relevant issue in a case such as this if the court has already determined affirmatively that the action of the defendant represented state action. This is so because

state action is an essential preliminary condition to § 1983 jurisdiction, and a failure to find state action disposes of such an action adversely to the plaintiff. \* \* \*

*Hall v. Quillen*, 631 F.2d at 1155 (citations omitted). *See also Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. 922, 936 (1982) ("Careful adherence to the 'state action' requirement . . . also avoids imposing on the State, its agencies or officials, responsibility for conduct for which they cannot fairly be blamed."); and *Burton v. Wilmington Parking Authority*, 365 U.S. 715, 721 (1961).<sup>4</sup>

Since the plaintiff is challenging the *Anders* brief filed in the direct appeal of his criminal case, this civil rights action is subject to summary dismissal because a right of action has not yet accrued. *See Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994):

We hold that, in order to recover damages for allegedly unconstitutional conviction or imprisonment, or for other harm caused by actions whose unlawfulness would render a conviction or sentence invalid, a § 1983 plaintiff must prove that the conviction or sentence has been reversed on direct appeal, expunged by executive order, declared invalid by a state tribunal authorized to make such a determination, or called into question by a federal court's issuance of a writ of habeas corpus, 28 U.S.C. § 2254. A claim for damages bearing that relationship to a conviction or sentence that has not been so invalidated is not cognizable under § 1983. Thus, when a state prisoner seeks damages in a § 1983 suit, the district court must consider whether a judgment in favor of the plaintiff would necessarily imply the invalidity of his conviction or sentence; if it would, the complaint must be dismissed unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has already been invalidated.

*Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. at 486-487 (footnote omitted). *See also Woods v. Candela*, 47 F.3d 545 (2nd Cir.) (litigant's conviction reversed by state court in 1993; hence, civil rights action timely

---

<sup>4</sup>*Burton* involved the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, not 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Federal courts have uniformly held that conduct which constitutes state action under the Fourteenth Amendment also constitutes action under color of state law, insofar as suits under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 are concerned. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48-49 (1988) (collecting cases).

filed), *cert. denied*, *Candela v. Woods*, 516 U.S. 808 (1995); *Treece v. Village of Naperville*, 903 F. Supp. 1251 (N.D. Ill. 1995); *Seaton v. Kato*, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS® 2380, \*12-\*13, 1995 WESTLAW® 88956 (N.D. Ill., February 28, 1995); and *Smith v. Holtz*, 879 F. Supp. 435 (M.D. Pa. 1995), *affirmed*, 87 F.3d 108 (3rd Cir.), *cert. denied*, *Wambaugh v. Smith*, 519 U.S. 1041 (1996).

Until the plaintiff's conviction or sentence is set aside, any civil rights action based on the conviction, sentence, direct appeal, and related matters will be barred because of the holding in *Heck v. Humphrey*. *Sufka v. Minnesota*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS® 84544, 2007 WESTLAW® 4072313 (D. Minn., November 15, 2007). Even so, the limitations period will not begin to run until the cause of action accrues. *See Benson v. New Jersey State Parole Board*, 947 F. Supp. 827, 830 & n. 3 (D.N.J. 1996) (following *Heck v. Humphrey*: "[b]ecause a prisoner's § 1983 cause of action will not have arisen, there need be no concern that it might be barred by the relevant statute of limitations."); and *Snyder v. City of Alexandria*, 870 F. Supp. 672, 685-88 (E.D. Va. 1994).

Even if the plaintiff had alleged conspiracy on the part of his appellate defender or the South Carolina Office of Appellate Defense with the state officials, such allegations will not defeat the applicability of *Heck v. Humphrey*. *See Parra v. New Hampshire*, 40 F.3d 1235 [Table], 1994 U.S.App. LEXIS® 31915, 1994 WESTLAW® 637001 (1st Cir., November 15, 1994), where the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit commented:

Given that there is no cause of action under § 1983 against the state actors, even proper allegations of conspiracy would not suffice to bring the private actors or the immune parties within the ambit of § 1983. Therefore, even if appellant's complaint had included more than conclusory allegations of collusion and conspiracy between private defendants, the prosecutors and local officials – which it did not – the § 1983 claims against those parties would still be foreclosed by *Heck*.

*Parra v. New Hampshire*, 1994 U.S.App. LEXIS® 31915 at \*6, 1994 WESTLAW® at \*2. *See also Gernard v. Idhe*, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS® 2607, 1995 WESTLAW® 91326, \*2 (N.D. Cal., February 28, 1995) ("There is no way that plaintiff can allege a massive conspiracy, in which over ten individuals conspired to convict him with fabricated and altered evidence, without simultaneously calling the integrity of his conviction into question."); and *Pinnick v. Mellen*, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS® 2883, \*1, 1995 WESTLAW® 96923, \*9 (D. Mass., February 28, 1995) (suit by prisoner against his former defense attorney: "The United States Supreme Court has made it clear that before a prisoner can seek injunctive or monetary relief that would call into question the validity of the conviction or sentence, he must have the conviction or sentence discredited by a state tribunal or by a writ of habeas corpus."). *Cf. Stubbs v. Hunter*, 806 F. Supp. 81, 82-83 (D.S.C. 1992); *Wetherington v. Phillips*, 380 F. Supp. 426, 428-29 (E.D.N.C. 1974), *affirmed*, 526 F.2d 591 (4th Cir. 1975)[Table]; and *Joyner v. Abbott Laboratories*, 674 F. Supp. 185, 191 (E.D.N.C. 1987).

Negligence is not actionable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See Daniels v. Williams*, 474 U.S. 327, 328-36 & n. 3 (1986); *Davidson v. Cannon*, 474 U.S. 344, 345-348 (1986); *Ruefly v. Landon*, 825 F.2d 792, 793-94 (4th Cir. 1987); and *Pink v. Lester*, 52 F.3d 73 (4th Cir. 1995) (applying *Daniels v. Williams* and *Ruefly v. Landon*: "The district court properly held that *Daniels* bars an action under § 1983 for negligent conduct[.]"). Secondly, 42 U.S.C. § 1983 does not impose liability for violations of duties of care arising under state law. *DeShaney v. Winnebago County Department of Social Services*, 489 U.S. 189, 200-203 (1989).

Negligence and legal malpractice<sup>5</sup> are causes of action under South Carolina law. *See, e.g., Epstein v. Brown*, 363 S.C. 372, 610 S.E.2d 816 (2005); *Brown v. Theos*, 345 S.C. 305, 550 S.E.2d 304 (2001), *affirming* 338 S.C. 305, 526 S.E.2d 232 (S.C.Ct.App. 1999); *Mitchell v. Holler*, 311 S.C. 406, 429 S.E.2d 793 (1993); and *Yarborough v. Rogers*, 306 S.C. 260, 411 S.E.2d 424 (1991). A civil action for negligence or legal malpractice would be cognizable in this court under the diversity statute, if that statute's requirements are satisfied. *Cianbro Corporation v. Jeffcoat and Martin*, 804 F. Supp. 784, 788-791 (D.S.C. 1992), *affirmed*, *Cianbro Corporation v. Jeffcoat and Martin*, 10 F.3d 806 [Table], 1993 U.S.App. LEXIS® 30080, 1993 WESTLAW® 478836 (4th Cir., November 22, 1993). The diversity statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a), requires complete diversity of parties and an amount in controversy in excess of seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000.00):

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between—

(1) citizens of different States[.]

28 U.S.C. § 1332. Complete diversity of parties in a case means that no party on one side may be a citizen of the same State as any party on the other side. *See Owen Equipment & Erection Co. v. Kroger*, 437 U.S. 365, 372-374 (1978). The plaintiff is a citizen of South Carolina and defendant

---

<sup>5</sup>It, however, should be noted that inquiries in a legal malpractice action are distinct from inquiries in a post-conviction (or habeas corpus) proceeding as to whether an attorney was "ineffective." Compare *Cianbro Corporation v. Jeffcoat and Martin*, 804 F. Supp. 784, 788-791 (D.S.C. 1992) (plaintiff in legal malpractice action must establish by expert testimony specific duty required of the attorney and the breach thereof), *affirmed*, *Cianbro Corporation v. Jeffcoat and Martin*, 10 F.3d 806 [Table], 1993 U.S.App. LEXIS® 30080, 1993 WESTLAW® 478836 (4th Cir., November 22, 1993), with *Hill v. Lockhart*, 474 U.S. 52, 56-60 (1985) (in a post-conviction or habeas corpus proceeding, a state prisoner must show that there is a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's alleged errors, he or she would not have been convicted).

Haile is also a citizen of South Carolina. Hence, complete diversity of parties is absent in this case. *See* 28 U.S.C. 1332; and *Strawbridge v. Curtiss*, 7 U.S. (3 Cranch) 267 (1806).

Assuming plaintiff's § 1983 claim is dismissed by this Court and plaintiffs' complaint somehow can be conceived to state an additional claim for relief under any state common law theory, the undersigned concludes that such claim(s), if any, ought to be dismissed as well for want of jurisdiction. Specifically, this Court can decline to continue the action as to the pendent claims if "the district court has dismissed all claims over which it has original jurisdiction." 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).

### ***Recommendation***

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the above-captioned case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. *See Denton v. Hernandez; Neitzke v. Williams; Haines v. Kerner; Brown v. Briscoe*, 998 F.2d 201, 202-204 & n. \* (4th Cir. 1993); *Boyce v. Alizaduh; Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d at 74; 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) [essentially a redesignation of "old" 1915(d)]; and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A [as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal]. The plaintiff's attention is directed to the Notice on the next page.

November 29, 2007  
Florence, South Carolina

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III  
Thomas E. Rogers, III  
United States Magistrate Judge

**Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The plaintiff is advised that he may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. **Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.** In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court judge need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

**Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
Post Office Box 2317  
Florence, South Carolina 29503**

**Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, *Schronce v. United States*, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984); and *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).